

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-24 are pending, with Claims 1 and 13 being independent. Claims 1-24 are being amended herein, with Claims 1, 4, 13 and 16 being amended to overcome rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and all claims being amended to replace use of the word “said” with the word “the.” Claim 16, objected to by the Examiner, is being amended to correct a minor typographical error by inserting the word “storage” between “readable” and “medium.” No new matter is being introduced by way of the claim amendments.

Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps amounting to a gap between the steps. Independent Claim 1 is being amended to recite “storing a first set of frames of the data stream into a data buffer during times clocks of the ingress and egress ends cannot be traced to a common reference source,” thereby relating the first elements of the claim with the seconds elements of the claim. Independent Claim 13 is being similarly amended. Support for the amendments may be found, at least, page 3, lines 3-5 of the application as originally filed. Further, the above amendments should be sufficient to overcome the rejection with respect to Claims 2-12 and 14-24, which depend from Claims 1 and 13, respectively. Therefore, following entry of the above amendments, with respect to these rejections, Applicants respectfully submit Claims 1-24 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claims 4 and 16 stand further rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention, and for lacking antecedent basis for the limitation “said header byte” (“the header byte” as amended). Claims 4 and 16 are being amended to depend from Claims 6 and 18, respectively, which introduce the elements of “a structure pointer” and to recite “wherein the structure pointer reserves a pointer value indicating that the header byte is not present within the packet.” Therefore, following entry of the above amendments, with respect to these additional rejections, Claims 4 and 16 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and provide proper antecedent basis.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections in the Office Action are now moot in view of the amendments. Applicants believe all claims are now in condition for allowance and

respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and that the application be allowed to pass to issue.


**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims currently pending, Claims 1-24, are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By

  
Gerald P. Kazanjian

Registration No. 61,699

Telephone: (978) 341-0036

Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Date: 3/3/2009